DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 330 650 SP 032 947

AUTHOR Griffin, Gary A.
TITLE Toward a Community of Learning: The Preparation and Continuing Education of Teachers. A Report of the Curriculum Committee of The Holmes Group to University and School Faculty Engaged in Educating Teachers.
INSTITUTION Holmes Group, Inc., East Lansing, MI.
REPORT NO Occasional Papers #5
PUB DATE Jan 91
NOTE 50p.
AVAILABLE FROM The Holmes Group, 501 Erickson Hall, East Lansing, MI 48824-1034.
PUB TYPE Reports - General (140)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Cultural Pluralism; *Curriculum Development; *Educational Principles; Higher Education; Inservice Teacher Education; Instruction; Leadership; Liberal Arts; *Preservice Teacher Education; School Community Relationship; *Teacher Education Curriculum; *Teacher Role
IDENTIFIERS *Holmes Group; Professional Development Schools

ABSTRACT

In five meetings between June 1988 and September 1989, the national curriculum committee of the Holmes Group, a consortium of 96 U.S. research universities committed to making their teacher education programs more rigorous and connected, came to agreement about fundamental principles that should underlie the curriculum of teacher education. In this report, these principles are presented and discussed within the framework of seven major topics: liberal learning, learning and knowing, teaching, curriculum, schools, leadership, diversity, and extended communities. Themes which emerge from the report include: (1) teacher education candidates should receive a comprehensive liberal education; (2) teachers should be committed to continuous learning for themselves, their students, and their colleagues; (3) teachers and teacher educators should be active curriculum workers; (4) teachers need to develop an understanding of school organization and dynamics; (5) teachers need to be prepared to understand and demonstrate the properties of effective leadership; (6) teachers need to be aware of diversity issues and able to make meaningful learning situations for all students; and (7) the learning community of classroom and school is part of the wider community. Four responses to the report are included. (IAH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Toward a Community of Learning: The Preparation and Continuing Education of Teachers

A report of the Curriculum Committee of The Holmes Group to university and school faculty engaged in educating teachers

January 1991

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SP032 947

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B Bradley West

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Toward a Community of Learning:
The Preparation and
Continuing Education of Teachers

A report of the Curriculum Committee
of The Holmes Group to university and school faculty
engaged in educating teachers

January 1991

In five meetings between June 1988 and September 1989, the Holmes Group's national Curriculum Committee came to agreement about fundamental principles that should underlie the curriculum of teacher education. The committee grouped these principles into logically related sets: Liberal Learning, Learning and Knowing, Teaching, Curriculum, Schools, Leadership, Diversity, and Extended Communities. In this report of their work, each is discussed separately, although it is obvious that each major topic influences and is influenced by all the others.

The report was written by committee chair Gary A. Griffin, then dean of the College of Education of the University of Illinois at Chicago, now professor of education at the University of Arizona.

The Curriculum Committee intended these principles to become sounding boards against which Holmes Group member institutions can resonate their individual unique curriculum decisions about program content, structure, expectations, assessment, cooperative institutional arrangements, and the like. To enrich such discussions, the Holmes Group Executive Board commissioned responses to the report from Lisa Delpit, Antoine M. Garibaldi, W. Robert Houston, and Ann Lieberman. Their essays are published here, following the report.

Judith E. Lanier
President

The Holmes Group, 501 Erickson Hall, East Lansing, MI 48824-1034

The Holmes Group is a consortium of 96 U.S. research universities committed to making their programs of teacher preparation more rigorous and connected—to liberal arts education, to research on learning and teaching, and to wise practice in the schools.

Contents

The Report

- Introduction 1
- Liberal Learning 2
- Learning and Knowing 6
- Teaching 9
- Curriculum 12
- Schools 15
- Leadership 19
- Diversity 23
- Extended Communities 26

Members of the Curriculum Committee 30

Commentary by Lisa Delpit 32

Commentary by Antoine M. Garibaldi 35

Commentary by W. Robert Houston 39

Commentary by Ann Lieberman 44

Toward a Community of Learning: The Preparation and Continuing Education of Teachers

In her award-winning book of essays, *The Having of Wonderful Ideas*, Eleanor Duckworth (1987) notes that the term "curriculum" can be taken as "ways of engaging students in giving thought to those matters we think important" (page 139). In that spirit, the Curriculum Committee of The Holmes Group has considered the curriculum for the preparation and continuing education of teachers. We wish to engage prospective, beginning, and experienced teachers, and teacher educators, in multiple ways of thinking deeply about teaching. We believe we can do this best not by promulgating schemes or specifications *for* curriculum—in the forms of specific objectives, particular pedagogical and subject matter content, and exit criteria—but by highlighting "matters we think important" and discussing each in some detail.

What's important for teachers derives in large part from our expectations for schools. The changes needed in U.S. schools are far wider and deeper than the currently fashionable call for schools to contribute to our nation's economic competitiveness in world markets. This argument is important, but it is seriously incomplete. Americans must also strive for schooling that defies the harsh realities of racism and poverty, that counters feelings of helplessness and isolation, that nurtures us through engagement with the arts, that encourages us to meet together on common ground as civil beings. We think these expectations can best be put into action in educational settings—both schools and schools of education—that are *communities of learning.*

Formal education is ideally a complex package that aims at arousing students' intellectual interests, giving them basic emotional satisfaction, and developing a feeling of solidarity with others—all this along with the acquisition of information and skills.

For a democracy to thrive intellectually, culturally, and economically, it is necessary that there be shared understandings, values, expectations, and aspirations—that is, a shared culture—rather than isolated and idiosyncratic visions held as private property. There must be both consensus and dissent. For citizens to engage fully with a democratic organization—whether social or governmental or educational—they must possess the habits of mind and dispositions that contribute to a sharing of problems and their solutions. Citizens need to be able to participate in a cross-cultural meeting of the minds, while still maintaining a sense of self, of identity, of particularistic cultural and intellectual tradition. In a democracy, the public school classroom should be a place where learning and teaching activities benefit the group as well as the individual, and where those activities are not dictated by issues of gender, race, class, handicapped status, or economic well-being.

For prospective teachers, we aim for far more than simply placing them in contact with knowledge and providing opportunities to observe outstanding practice, useful as those two sets of activities may be. We want teachers to work with students in classrooms that are true learning communities. Therefore, we think their experiences in teacher education must provide stimulating examples of alternate ways to create and maintain a learning community. We want teachers to construct curriculum that impels powerful learning because it integrates knowledge from several subjects. Therefore, we want would-be teachers to experience, not only read about, lessons that are integrated—as when their chemistry, mathematics, and science education faculty prepare courses and teach in collaborative ways. We want teachers to work together in a school in intellectually and practically sound and reinforcing ways. Therefore, they should observe such collaboration among the faculty in their preservice programs.

We believe communities of learning should be demonstrated not just in schools but in the university, as faculties in education and in the arts and sciences form a *teacher education faculty* that works in cooperative ways on teacher preparation and related research. Further, universities need to form more intellectually solid and organizationally considerate relationships with elementary and secondary schools—a community of interest for the education of prospective teachers. Such new arrangements, called "professional development schools," are being formed by Holmes Group members to provide opportunities for experienced teachers to work with their own students, their colleagues, teacher educators, and prospective teachers.

In a professional development school, university educators will become more directly involved in the persistent problems of practice. Cross-institutional teams will plan, implement, and reflect upon ways to improve curriculum, instruction, and school organization. Inquiry will be joined strongly to practice. Leadership will come from the diversity among members in this community of interest. The concept is described in the second Holmes Group report, *Tomorrow's Schools: Principles for the Design of Professional Development Schools* (1990).

Liberal Learning

From preschool through college, the curriculum is in essence the liberal arts and sciences. Thus teacher education requires its students to have a deep and broad education in humanities and science. U.S. schools are expected to prepare extravagantly diverse students for productive work, participative citizenship, and a principled life. A community of learners must be brought together, in the classroom and the school, by means of teachers'

professionalism and leadership. Teachers' moral and ethical principles and purposes must address success—beyond quantifiable measures—for all children. Teachers' task in America in the next few generations is, for the first time in human history, to make liberal learning available to everybody's children.

A comprehensive liberal education has two primary purposes: 1) preservation—to pass on the knowledge, history, cultures and traditions of the past to the current generation; and 2) creation—to enable students to become lifelong learners who will themselves create new knowledge and new discoveries. Teachers alone among the educated are asked to embody this ideal in their daily work. Aristotle pointed to an enduring truth: the test of one's ownership of an idea is the ability to teach it to somebody else.

By this criterion, the prospective teacher's study of the disciplines will include attention to the history, methodology, and purpose of each discipline as well as to how their content is learned and taught. Teachers should encounter the disciplines not as fixed bodies of facts and skills but as human activities that grow and change because problems change and people's views of what is important change.

Teacher candidates' general studies and majors now seldom provide opportunity for them to delve into a subject in this way in advanced courses or in advanced sections of introductory courses. An arts and sciences curriculum designed to achieve the dual purposes of preservation and creation would include the following orientations toward subjects. These curricular components, of course, would be modified for individual institutional settings.

Mathematics. Teachers need to develop their own sense of mathematical power so that they can help individual students develop confidence to solve nonroutine problems. They should understand mathematics as a way of representing real-world problem situations in mathematical terms, statements, sentences, or diagrams; know a variety of ways of manipulating the mathematical representations to get answers or make predictions; and know how to validate the answers or predictions. Our technological society is inundated with information that increasingly is represented using mathematics. It is critical for teachers to know how such representations are made, how to interpret and analyze such data, and how one builds convincing justifications for answers or predictions. Only with such knowledge will teachers be able to lead students away from helpless acceptance of mathematically justified assertions to autonomous, thoughtful critique and analysis.

Science. Every teacher needs to understand the natural world and how it operates. This means an awareness of the basic concepts and methodologies used in the physical and biological sciences, as

well as a more sophisticated knowledge of at least one area of science. Teachers' science courses should attend to the implications of recent scientific developments for the future. Most important, their laboratory sections should be experiences of scientific method, developing dispositions and techniques for inquiry and problem solving.

History. Teachers need a solid sense of the major figures, events, and forces in American history. Prospective teachers need to ponder the interaction of contributing cultures with the dominant culture and the extent to which these interactions result in splintering or integrating a society. They should themselves handle the kinds of documents, materials and ideas that historians use to interpret events and societies. They must have preparation in world history in order to enable their students to understand that the United States is one neighborhood in the global village.

Literature and Fine Arts. Every teacher should understand the role of the arts in developing civilization and whole human beings. Far more than a pleasant ornament to life, the written, visual, and performing arts offer visions of the world of human experience that can be expressed no other way. Art that they observe, perform, or create should be explored and analyzed for meanings that integrate knowledge and personal experience.

Social Structures and Behavior. Teachers need to understand how and why people form groups in order to function as a society. This knowledge should include the nature and purpose of governmental, religious, political, economic, and social organizations and how they function. Prospective teachers should experience as part of this study the building of a participatory, collaborative work group that models in the classroom the principles of democratic interaction.

Second Languages. Oral proficiency in a second language is valued both for developing appreciation of the ways in which any language shapes its speaker's awareness and thought and for developing appreciation of a specific culture other than one's own. A focus of the classroom experience for prospective teachers should be the enjoyment of diversity and the acceptance of the values and traditions of other than majority cultures.

Besides academic subject matter, liberal education conveys academic dispositions and habits of mind. These are learned most effectively by being used, taught, modeled, and reinforced in a variety of academic courses and from a variety of instructors.

Literacy: Reading, Listening, Speaking, Writing, Numeracy, and Inquiry. The ability to communicate ideas, feelings, and information in oral and written forms is essential to all other kinds of knowledge and to successful functioning in today's society. Also important are the skills of data collection, interpretation, and analysis as a basis for informed decision making.

Critical Thinking. The ability to reason well, to analyze raw data, to draw sound conclusions, to recognize irrelevancies, and to reject sloppy arguments is essential to a successful understanding of the academic disciplines. A liberal education has traditionally offered the development of skills in critical thinking as a major result of its varied curriculum. Such skills are the foundation for the development of a critical view—challenging rather than accepting simple-minded solutions or grandiose schemes.

Appreciation of Diverse Cultures. The ability to recognize, accept, and value cultural differences in our pluralistic society is fundamental to becoming a teacher. This sensitivity is learned not merely through a wide variety of courses but through professors' approaches to their subjects and their interactions with diverse students, as well as through students' positive experiences in and out of the classroom with students from other cultures.

International Awareness. Understanding the role of the United States in relationship to the rest of the world is key to our nation's successful functioning. Teachers should gain understanding of the interdependency of the nations of the world in political, social, and economic terms.

Ethics and Social Responsibility. The ability to understand the consequences of decisions and actions in ethical terms is critical to developing a sense of responsibility in individuals and in society at large. The moral responsibility of the teaching act and of the organizers of the learning setting should be implicit in all the prospective teachers' courses and campus experiences.

Interconnectedness of Knowledge. Teachers need to understand deeply how one branch of knowledge intersects with other branches. This "connectedness" should characterize experiences in classrooms at all levels of schooling. For example, using a 19th century novel as the focus of analysis by a literary scholar, a historian, an economist, and a scientist could be a vehicle for developing such awareness.

Learning and Teaching. Professors and teacher educators need to be conscious of and enact to their students not only the content of the subject but also the key understandings and techniques they use to transform that content as they teach it. Teaching is a sophisticated way of learning, a process whereby successful learners—children as well as adults—interpret knowledge and generate new knowledge. Those who teach in the university should be living models of lifelong learning and should be able to create rich intellectual environments that inspire their students to inquire into their own learning and teaching.

Lived Democracy. A liberal education should provide the basis for dissent, democratic struggle, and renewal. Democracy is understood not only through study; it is understood through lived experience.

Both university and school classrooms should be communities of learning in which all participants can be involved in learning and in teaching, in confronting and creating change, and in giving meaning to their lives.

Educators need to move away from the language of achievement or failure, winners and losers, facts and skills, gifted-normal-remedial-special, to the language of learning that enables more learning, knowledge that holds meaning for life. Our society needs teachers who define success not only in academic terms but as social, moral, and personal growth as well.

Learning and Knowing

Teachers must be committed to continuous learning: their own, their colleagues', and their students'. They should know that humans do not passively receive knowledge that possesses meaning for them; they construct it out of past and current, informal and formal learning experiences in and out of classrooms. Novice teachers come to this awareness only as they are led to observe and question what they see and do in classrooms, rather than just follow directions. Teachers' inquiry about their practice need not be formal but it must be systematic, ongoing, cumulative, open to alteration. Teacher candidates should participate with fellow students in constructing their own meaning from experience during the course of their preparation, and then as teachers they should continue to review their work with colleagues. The rewards will be several: their sense of professionalism, productive interactions with their colleagues, influence over the policy and practice of teaching and schooling, and expanding the repertoire of ways their students learn.

Conversations about schooling almost inevitably turn to issues of whether or not children and youth are learning. Curiously, such talk seldom treats *how* students learn. Not so curiously, but equally seldom, talk about schools does not include reference to what or how teachers and other school professionals learn. In fact, there seems to be a prevailing view that what is learned is something that is given and received: given by a teacher who already knows to a student who is expected to learn and then know; given by a teacher educator who already knows to a novice who is expected to learn and then know. This convention of knowledge and meaning as commodities to be passed from one person to another as intact and immutable truth is prevalent in our society and nowhere more evident than in our schools, including our higher education institutions.

Certainly, there are many instances when the quick pass-along of a piece of information is helpful—as complex intellectual puzzles are pieced together, as social dilemmas present themselves, as a stream

of creativity is momentarily blocked. The widespread practice of using the pass-along form of learning about the world and its multiple cultural, physical, and social realities has not, however, been accompanied by evidence that it is effective in developing habits of mind that rise to, rather than are defeated by, the challenge of complex problems. Pass-along pedagogy has not proven to be helpful in thinking through moral dilemmas associated with the ways that people get along together. We need a pedagogy that leads children, youth, and adults to find satisfaction in learning over their lifetimes, rather than just during schooling sessions.

We believe that teachers who construct their own understandings of subject matter and of teaching, with the helpful but not all-knowing cooperation of experts in the disciplines and in teaching, are more likely to continue to work together toward understanding the complexities of learning and teaching and of schooling in a society. Teachers who have the disposition to be curious about what they encounter, rather than to accept what they see as inevitable and given, are more likely to seek alternate ways of solving problems, overcoming obstacles, and understanding the ways that their students learn. Teacher candidates whose preparation curriculum has challenged them to describe how and why and under what circumstances they know that a given phenomenon is what they think it is are likely to become teachers who offer the same challenges to their students. Students who come to the acts of learning and knowing with a self-conscious understanding of how they are approaching those acts and how they are coming to conclusions, will, in the end, be more satisfied and productive members of our society. In short, we believe that active and conscious learning is a central dynamic of a community of learning.

This calls for studies in the disciplines and in teaching that promote questioning as well as provide information; examine evidence as well as read about physical or social phenomena; use time for thinking about what is seen and experienced rather than for repeating to professors what has been heard or read about or observed. There is an important role in the teacher education curriculum for the formal presentation of knowledge about the learning climate in classrooms—for examples, motivation and learning theory. However, it is critical that formal course work be more concerned with application and use.

Criteria for education studies

A program of education studies that depends upon meaningful experience and concentrating consciously on that experience as the stuff of learning calls for extraordinarily careful selection from the myriad experiences prospective and veteran teachers might have. Teacher educators need to examine and select teaching and schooling situations for their students on the basis of three criteria: 1) they represent valuable learnings for youngsters; 2) they spark teachers to learn actively—grappling for

meaning, acting from understanding, and reflecting; 3) they are adaptable to the experiential or developmental stage of individual teacher candidates or teachers.

A text-based course in developmental psychology does not by itself satisfy these criteria. One or two observations of children in classrooms, using a predetermined checklist of research-verified indications of stages of development, will not by itself lead the teacher or prospective teacher to an understanding of how children come to learn and know. Presenting lectures to teachers about learning will not be powerful unless rich field experiences follow, in which teachers work in groups as they puzzle through different perceptions of what they believe is happening in the instructional setting. Teachers who feel they have to hold back their own views about what is right and true in a given situation will not contribute to the creation of a community that examines teaching and learning phenomena through a number of lenses.

Several kinds of activities satisfy our criteria about learning through involvement:

- cooperative investigations into persistent dilemmas of teaching;
- working together on short- and long-term projects that result in a product that is shared, critiqued, defended;
- systematic interaction with one or two school-age students over time, accompanied by analysis, problem identification and solution, and reflection;
- membership in study groups whose attention is focused on understanding central aspects of teaching and schooling;
- think-aloud sessions where individuals share with colleagues in their cohort their emerging and changing views about teaching.

We have more knowledge than we are using in teacher education. For example, we do not demonstrate our knowledge that adults learn by making connections of prior experience with new information. We also know that different people use different ways to learn something, but we seldom provide multiple avenues for prospective and experienced teachers to make sense of teaching.

We know that teachers at various stages of their careers have different concerns and deal with teaching issues differently, but our teacher education programs seldom reflect these career stage differences. Instead of pretending that all teachers approach a curriculum issue or ways of thinking about students in the same way, we should provide professional growth opportunities that have some fit with teachers' developmental stages.

In order to enrich the learning opportunities of children and youth, learning must be recast in teacher education. It should be an active, probing, questioning, decision-making, inventing, experimenting, curiosity-laden set of cumulative events for students of teaching and for teacher educators.

Teaching

Teaching is a deeply intellectual activity. It cannot be prescribed as a set of inviolate steps or demonstrated as adherence to predetermined and unchangeable strategies. Instead, teaching is mutable, propositional, always open to thoughtful revision, modification, and adaptation. Scholarship in the arts and sciences is characterized by discourse and criticism. Teaching, then, is subject to questioning by self as well as with one's colleagues; not only for traditional supervision or evaluation but as a means toward continually becoming a better teacher. This way of teaching calls for self-conscious reflection, for regular observation by colleagues, and for discussions of the core and accouterments of teaching with other educators. Students of teaching should encounter the various ways of thinking about and doing teaching: as proposed by theory, or supported by research, or reflected on after a teaching episode. Such awareness is likely to lead to thoughtful consideration and experimentation rather than to passive adoption. In developing the concepts and practices of an education studies program, teacher educators should work together with expert teachers. Questions about what constitutes good teaching should be career-long preoccupations rather than questions that are answered once and for all in a preservice or inservice program.

Teaching cannot be summarized in any single, simple formula, as policy makers sometimes attempt to do when they define "good" teaching in simple ways. A considerable amount of rich educational research on practice has been completed in the last fifteen years and has value for teachers and teacher educators. That research is neither the only nor for most students even the best way to think about teaching.

We believe that learning, in largest measure, is *encountering and engaging with* "what is worth knowing"; therefore, teachers must know how to teach toward those active encounters and engagements. We believe that learning is the construction of meaning as a consequence of experience; therefore, teachers must be empowered and encouraged to provide opportunities for learning that is actively experienced. We believe that learning is strengthened by thoughtful discussion, invention, experimentation, and sharing of ideas; therefore, teachers must understand how to organize, monitor, and stimulate instructional groups. We believe that current and future learning is influenced by prior

experience and accumulated meaning; therefore teachers must be able to draw upon knowledge of students' prior learning and plan meaningful lessons around them.

To do this and more, teaching must be considered as an activity directed by mindfulness, by sensitivity to past and present as well as future possibilities, by a broad and deep repertoire of lessons and activities. Teaching is informed not by a belief in "the one right way" but by a coherent network of bits and pieces of knowledge that can be brought into play to respond to the nature of students, the intentions of curriculum, and the context of instruction. Importantly, teaching must be considered from a *provisional* stance, guided by conscious deliberation about what appears to be working, what should be refined or abandoned, what can be moved from thought to activity.

This way of teaching has several interactive components.

1. **Forming a view or views of good teaching.** Prospective teachers are encouraged early in their preservice programs to state and defend their views of teaching: what it is, what it is meant to accomplish, what its dilemmas and rewards are, and what is problematic about it. As these neophyte teachers begin to actually teach, they are required to use their practice, and related understandings arising from other sources, to refine their views and rationalize their changed or sustained positions. This conscious and often public reflection is one of the crucial aspects of becoming a teacher and continues throughout a career.

2. **Dialogue with colleagues about teaching.** Reflection, refinement of practice, and conscious learning from experience are significant components of the *collegium* of teachers, an ongoing dialogue with others about what teaching is and can be. They exchange pieces of their practice, learn from one another, seek out alternative views, ask for assistance, develop new ways of looking at their own work, pose questions and testable hypotheses about how to improve their teaching, and develop the disposition to constantly hone their craft. Novice teachers should be introduced to the collegium that extends beyond their schools and communities to national professional associations of teachers and other educators committed to study and improvement of particular subject matter curricula and other aspects of schooling.

3. **Reflection on good teaching throughout a career.** Teacher education programs should seriously examine the many propositions and programs that claim to improve teaching technique, and so should teachers on school faculties. Programs may be imposed by state or local mandates, used poorly or translated improperly from research or theory. Both prospective and experienced teachers should figure out what each program intends to achieve and within what particular contexts of instruction; they should examine programs and techniques in the light of their own views, the views of others, and their

own experience. In this way teachers can keep open the options from which they choose as they work with different children and youth.

4. **Inquiry and experimentation.** Teaching in a community of learning will depend for eventual success largely on the degree to which inquiry and experimentation characterize a significant portion of the work of teachers. Schools and the learning groups in them are not all the same. The differences from one school to another and within schools argue strongly against a one-best-way conception of teaching and strongly for teachers' deep understanding of the school culture and their selection, through inquiry and experimentation, of the ways that the school's students can best be taught.

This inquiry and experimentation need not follow the same traditions of research that characterize higher education or research organizations. Teacher education should model and foster evaluation practices that objectively examine results of learning programs and instructional methods and that raise new questions. Evaluation should advance as well as assess learning and stimulate a teacher's self-evaluation as the mark of a professional's independent learning. Further, there is a growing body of work on teachers' action research on topics pertinent to their classrooms and schools. Students of teaching and their cooperating teachers should be encouraged to develop such projects. Whatever its form, teachers' inquiry and experimentation should be public, be a part of collegial interactions, be documented systematically, and become subjects of discourse. Such investigations should be valued not just for solving particular problems but as a way of continually refreshing the vision of the school.

5. **Contributing to the knowledge of teaching.** Teachers are learners, and many of them are leaders. As learners they recognize the importance of staying abreast with and contributing to knowledge about teaching and learning and schools. As leaders they understand the urgency of persuading their colleagues to do the same. These are mutually reinforcing aspects of professional life. This expanded view of teachers as learners and leaders in a profession should spur teacher education programs to involve student teachers and cooperating teachers in evaluation and action research. These are new views of teachers' work in schools and in schools of education. Excellent teachers learn as they teach, and professional teachers invest the outcomes of that learning in their interactions with colleagues.

If teacher education programs are to contribute to this view of teaching, they will have to give up entrenched conventions:

- packaged prescriptions for practice, such as the one best way to plan a lesson;
- scheduling field placement only at the conclusion of preparation;
- sending student teachers into schools without accompanying interpretive seminars;

- letting cooperating/supervising teachers decide for themselves the ways that student teachers think about and discover teaching;
- relying on "desirable research-based" teaching behaviors as the sole resource for thinking about teaching;
- emphasizing visiting experts or isolated staff development episodes as principal ways to influence teachers' work.

Contrary to these conventions, teachers' need to to think out loud together about teaching, in the understanding that improving teaching is a matter for a particular faculty—not, on the one hand, restricted to isolated individuals or, on the other, blanketing whole systems. Many of the problems stated in terms of school and student learning "outcomes" can be reduced if teachers bring to their work personally experienced, well-considered knowledge about options, an inclination to reflect alone and with colleagues, and the discipline and spirit of inquiry and experimentation noted here.

Breaking the habits of teaching by the rules, and replacing them with habits of selecting from options and engaging in inquiry is not easy. These changes in teacher preparation and continuing education programs have to be negotiated among higher education institutions, elementary and secondary schools, and state and local policy bodies. This requires beefing up institutional relationships that, in most places, at this time, can only be described as fragile.

Curriculum

Teachers in a school that is a learning community work actively on their curriculum. To do this, they need to have convictions about what is important for learning and for living, and they need to understand the dynamics of classrooms and schools in which students help each other learn. Teachers should have developed knowledge, judgment, resourcefulness, and the attitudes and skills to take part in school decisions, so that they can select, adapt, and develop lessons, units, and courses that propel students beyond mastering facts and skills. Teachers should be able to adapt and create learning materials that illuminate and expand students' concerns and interests, stimulate their prediction about and preparation for future problems and prospects, and lead them to experience intellectual, social, physical, and emotional rewards.

Teachers should be engaged in systematic review and strengthening of the school's whole course of study. They should be expert in analyzing existing curricula, skillful in adapting such curricula to particular student groups, and inventive in creating curricula that are not available from other sources. This curriculum work should be done, for the most part, by teachers working together and with other relevant parties, although individual teachers should feel enabled to make curriculum for particular groups of students in their classrooms.

All of these principles apply as well to teacher educators and their work on university curricula for the preparation of teachers.

This conception of teachers and teacher educators as active curriculum workers rather than receivers and implementors of others' curricula, is grounded in several convictions.

1. Curriculum should be adapted or designed for a particular school. Although school subject matter may be very similar across schools in a district, or, indeed, the whole nation, the ways that subject matter is considered within schools should differ dramatically. Similarly, in teacher education programs, much of the curriculum may be dictated by state or national accrediting agencies. Rather than continue the widespread practice of imposing the same curriculum upon teachers (and student teachers) of disparate backgrounds and circumstances, teachers and teacher educators should tailor learning materials to fit the expectations, prior learning, cultural traditions, and social situations of the students they teach. The knowledge most crucial to student success is knowledge of these students and their local community. Teachers and teacher educators must be free and be able to translate school subjects into terms that have meaning in their students' present and future lives.

2. Schools are situated in their own unique histories, their own current conditions and problems and tensions, their own aspirations. Teachers' and teacher educators' understandings of this background should shape a school's immediate and long-term goals. These in turn should be enacted through curriculum selected, designed, and coordinated in a coherent learning plan.

It is desirable for teachers to work within an overall conception of curriculum goals and a range of options for teaching particular subjects. These goals and options can serve as guides for school-level curriculum decision making. For example, the National Science Teachers Association has advanced a national certification program for science teachers as an attempt to reach general consensus about the content, structure, and organization of a rigorous, modern science curriculum. NSTA believes that it is not cost effective or professionally productive to have all school districts make disconnected curriculum decisions about science. In another instance, the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics has advanced a set of curriculum and evaluation standards for school mathematics—the

content that should be included in school, how it should be taught, and how learning should be evaluated. Within such frameworks, which are efforts to bring needed standardization to the school curriculum, considerable discretion about curriculum decisions for identified students deliberately is left to local school professionals.

3. Teachers should also turn to one another, as they devote their attention to what is most worthy to learn and how that can best be taught to their own students. They should give each other reasons for what they do with students, and consider not only what students do with an individual teacher, for a semester or a year, but what they work on over their whole span of study in that school. The absence of such collaboration by teachers contributes to curriculum ills that plague our schools today:

- little coherence in what is studied over time,
- repetitious subject matter across grade levels,
- lack of choices in how to learn a subject among students at the same age or grade,
- superficial coverage of too many pieces of content, some of them trivial,
- concentration upon lower-order thinking processes,
- relegation of the arts and humanities to the sidelines,
- dependence upon print at the expense of artifacts and primary sources and upon textbooks that do not implement research, such as that on cooperative learning.

How can teacher preparation contribute to a conception of the teacher as a curriculum decision maker? Prospective teachers should attend early on and throughout their preparation programs to the flow of school curriculum over time. This means that they will examine curriculum rationale, purpose, content, and activities from the perspective of the student spending years in the school as well as from the perspective of the teacher of some of the students for a semester or a year.

As neophyte teachers follow the curriculum-in-action from the point of view of the elementary or secondary student, they should begin to draw conclusions about redundancy, repetition, coherence, relevance. They should learn to formulate ideas about the sequence of content, the cumulative power of learning opportunities, the reinforcement and additive properties of interaction among lessons, and subject-to-subject relationships. These studies—and their probing reflections on their own past schooling—should begin to develop novice teachers' sensitivity to the ways elementary and secondary students respond to separate subjects and to their whole 12-year course of study.

As these prospective teachers talk about the curricula of schools among themselves and with teacher educators and expert resource persons, they should be introduced to alternative ways of thinking about curriculum and to the transforming ways of presenting curriculum through educational technology. Student teachers should be placed in schools where these alternatives can be experienced in action. The courses in which they are enrolled should exemplify innovative curriculum of proven effect. Students should live within their own teacher education curriculum self-consciously and use that lived experience as a major resource for coming to tentative conclusions about curriculum for children and youth. Their field experiences, particularly student teaching, should give sustained and serious attention to such questions as "whose curriculum," "based on what assumptions," "toward what purposes," and "with what consequences for students and teachers." They should be asked to decide what is important.

Beginning teachers should be encouraged to work with their senior colleagues on curriculum that is deemed important to their school. This work should be seen as professional development for all concerned and as a significant contribution to the school. System-level assistance, probably in the form of subject matter experts and developers of instructional materials, should be provided, but the primary decision-making roles should be reserved for teachers. School curriculum should be a major strand of activity in staff development programs. More than lesson planning or "make and take" workshops, this should be deeply intellectual experiences from which teachers learn their own lessons about how best to present to children the world and its cultures.

Professional development programs for experienced teachers should focus on how they can be central and knowledgeable participants in such curriculum decisions as textbook adoption and adaptation, syllabus development, interpretation and use of test results, in-class adaptation of local or state curriculum objectives, and invention and creation of curriculum materials. To prepare for such involvement, teachers need to be encouraged and supported in taking risks.

Schools

Good schools are places where teachers and students are enabled and encouraged to inquire, invent, and experiment—even to risk failure. These qualities are likely to emerge and flourish only where the school and its classrooms function as a community of learners. Such learning communities are likely to be developed only where teachers understand the values of community and are determined to work in this way. These values and attitudes in teachers need to be fostered by professional education studies in which prospective teachers consider

schools as constructed human cultures; compare various forms of school governance; examine the relation of the school to the immediate community and the broader society; deeply ponder the role played by schools in the social, intellectual, and emotional growth of children and youth; and discern the impact of a variety of school-level variables upon teachers and administrators as well as on students.

Teachers need to develop an understanding of schools that does not rest only on seeing shortcomings but also promotes willingness and ability to bring about change. Existing practice is rooted in beliefs that organize roles, schools, classrooms, lessons, and curriculum. When there are calls for change in the fundamental ways that schools operate, teachers—both novices and veterans—need to attend to the factors that are promoting and supporting the status quo. Changing belief systems is no easy task. Teacher education programs, whether at preservice, induction, or inservice levels, can contribute to this understanding of change and can explore how it is accomplished. This means that teacher education programs must change, too. Preservice programs now tend to reinforce many of the problems of schools, not because of intentions to preserve schools in today's image but because of neglect of these organizational issues. Similarly, the effect of large numbers of inservice programs is to ensure that new and experienced teachers conform to schools as they are, that teachers become willing participants in business as usual.

Teacher education must take account of the many sources of demand and suggestion for changing schools: recent research, persistent criticism by policy bodies, and programs developed by teachers' and administrators' associations and subject matter organizations and study groups.

This report calls for different ways of thinking about learning, for new styles of teaching and reflecting upon teaching, and for conceptualizing and trying out new curriculum. These proposals have to be forged in the crucible of schools and classrooms. What is needed is a recasting of that crucible and the resources to do that.

What good schools look like

Prospective teachers in their courses and clinical work must be helped to assess the ends, means, and structures of schools against the criterion of a school as a community of learning. Early in their preparation, they need to develop the intellectual and practical skills of observation and analysis so that they can spot school features that support or impede educators collaborating and children cooperating. They need to be able to look at a school situation from the outside or the inside and figure out with others why the school functions as it does. Their exercise of judgment about organizing

and running schools should grow over time, not only through formal academic readings and lectures but through a series of intellectual and practical tasks.

Teachers should understand that "restructuring" will not improve schools unless it serves to make a better community for learning. Reorganization of a school should not be undertaken solely from an administrative or management or union point of view—toward greater efficiency, say, or as a way to involve teachers in decisions—but as an honest, probing, and canny attempt to improve students' learning and the quality of everyone's life in the school.

In preservice programs, prospective teachers must be helped to remove the institutional blinders that are often the result of themselves having been students in schools for more than 12 years. They need to question what they have come to believe is customary and desirable. The patterns and rules of schooling and of public organizations that they take for granted must be brought to the surface of their understanding and intensely scrutinized alongside different conceptions of how adults and youth work, learn, and solve problems productively together.

Considerations of school change will be only rhetorical—without intellectual integrity—if teachers lack well-developed visions about what good schools look like. The shadow play between their convictions of what should be and their analyses of what exists will lead to useful hypotheses about what school features must be changed for their beliefs to become reality.

The school of education must provide prospective teachers with opportunities for gaining theoretical and practical understandings of schools as organizations, for formulating options for change, for developing initial visions about possibilities. Teacher educators can strive to apprentice novices in schools where principals and teachers are working out new conceptions of the school as an organization.

Fluid roles, tasks, schedules

For teachers-in-service, collaboration in the preparation of young professionals in their school should go hand in hand with:

- developing new norms and defining new roles for experienced teachers;
- rearranging the teacher's work day to provide time and forums for ongoing dialogue about school issues;
- interpreting and applying the extensive new research knowledge applicable to current issues of learning and teaching;

- reallocating staff and budget.

It is futile to speak of advancing teachers' professionalism without working with teachers and administrators to alter the organization and working conditions and time use in schools. Teachers' work on these issues should be viewed as staff development because it should serve as a vehicle for them to improve and renew their instructional work.

Both prospective and experienced teachers need to see schools as fluid organizations, places that can be reconstructed over time. They need practice in the work of change—thinking aloud together, formulating proposals, testing the proposals, reflecting on the consequences of the changes. They need to know the importance of challenging business as usual, asking pointed questions about why certain practices prevail while alternatives are ignored. They need to broaden their vision of the possible.

Learning how to accomplish school change will come only as a consequence of participation in school change. Eventually schools of education should provide prospective teachers with the experience of being junior partners in professional development schools, where their cooperating and mentor teachers engage in the tough work of altering existing practice. In any event, students of teaching must be helped to understand that the movement toward a changed view of schooling is accompanied by argumentation, frustration, anxiety, fatigue. It is important that young teachers come to see this complex process of change as a natural and desirable school phenomenon, not as an exercise in confrontation and defeat.

If large numbers of school of education graduates move into their first teaching situations with the mindset suggested here, it is likely that they will have considerable influence upon how school is kept in the nation's communities. Further, if they participate in continuing professional development focused on refining and deepening their understanding of schools as mutable human organizations, they will become an extraordinary resource for school improvement—a resource only modestly available in today's schools.

An ideal opportunity for prospective and experienced teachers to gain experience and insights into school change exists in Holmes Group schools of education. As they make changes in their teacher education programs, they can make teachers partners in organizing professional development schools, redesigning clinical experiences, reconceptualizing the intellectual and practical content of professional courses, and teaching them in the schools.

Leadership

Today's teachers already are concerned with leadership, their own and others', as evidenced by the growing rhetoric of "empowerment" and schemes for site-based management of schools in which teachers are full participants. Tomorrow's teachers must be conscientiously prepared to understand and demonstrate the properties of effective leadership—which include the leader's willingness to stand out from the crowd, to challenge norms, to evoke high standards and responsibility, to serve, and to share authority and tasks. Not always, but often enough, leadership is distinct from power that derives from position. Teachers need to understand these differences and assume leadership when appropriate, regardless of official role. Indeed, leadership is intrinsic in any teaching and is enacted by all teachers both as they work with student groups and when they work with colleagues and other adults. Particular leadership positions should arise from and be defined by the needs of the school and faculty and should not be imposed upon teachers from outside. Many of the traditional hierarchies that characterize schools today are counterproductive to the development of leadership and useful new leadership positions for teachers. These new views of teacher leadership affect administrator education as well as teacher education.

A commitment to teacher leadership rests on the conviction that many teachers are experts. Not all teachers excel in all aspects of teaching, but many teachers can be expert in some of them. The expertise will be distributed differently within different groups of teachers. Teacher talent should be used wherever it's found so that teachers who are expert in some area can provide leadership, based upon their expert status and not upon their organizationally rationalized role in the school hierarchy, to their colleagues. For example, the teacher who is particularly adept at repairing students' arithmetic errors by discovering their conceptual misunderstandings can share the knowledge he or she uses in that diagnostic work. A teacher who has specialized knowledge and collections in some branch of history can offer opportunities for colleagues to tap into those. Yet another teacher may have particular skill in questioning techniques. Teachers who offer informal leadership based upon expertise constitute resources a school or district cannot afford to ignore.

This form of leadership is particularly amenable to the concept of the school as a community of learning. In this view, the staff's interactions are focused on important questions and problems, and much of the intellectual and practical support for those interactions resides in the school. But teachers can exert this form of leadership only in a school whose structure is consonant with our earlier principles of schools as learning communities.

The content and process of teacher education must be the context in which prospective teachers develop the expectation that becoming a teacher does not only mean teaching in a classroom but also being a member of a professional community that shares knowledge and experience and is prepared to do disciplined inquiry. How do we solve this problem? Who has dealt with a similar problem or has heard of a solution? What have they done? Will what they did work in this setting? How could we adapt it? What new strategy might we design? How will we evaluate whether our strategy has worked or not? How will we share our findings with colleagues?

Advanced positions within teaching

As personal and school needs emerge and converge, teachers may seek advancement. Sometimes this should involve going outside the school and taking advanced graduate work. However, teachers in a school that functions as a learning community would make such a decision based upon personal and intellectual interests and perceived benefit to the school rather than simply to gain higher compensation or to make some conventional hierarchical career move into administration. This different view of graduate-degree work by teachers has profound implications for schools of education. They will be called upon to think of themselves also as learning communities, rather than as credentialling communities.

An advanced position within teaching should require that the person be sensitive to and able to learn and to teach in several different ways. The teacher in such a position should bring to the community of learning a broad understanding of problems of practice and a willingness to assume a central voice in building and sharing a "technical culture." This is a set of concepts, research findings, and verifiable knowledge that is constantly evolving and changing but that provides both novice and experienced teachers with a tradition and norms they can draw upon to inform their individual practice. A technical culture is built upon knowledge derived from different ways of knowing—scholarship, experience, professional reading, inquiry, intuition, insight—and it values nurturing teachers as persons as well as professionals.

The Holmes Group has promoted the concept of teacher leaders in its recommendation that some teachers should become "career professional teachers." These teachers, because of inclination, expertise, earned status, and advanced preparation, would continue to work with students but would add leadership tasks such as staff development, curriculum development and coordination, mentoring, and teaching prospective teachers.

Holmes Group institutions adopting this concept would develop a new, advanced course of study that prepares an expert, experienced teacher to become a designated teacher leader in a school. Recipients

of such a degree would use this preparation to return to teaching and use it as the platform from which to promote the development of the school as a learning community—where teachers as well as students are viewed as learners; where professional growth is conceived as a continuous, ongoing, daily process; and where experienced teachers collaboratively and professionally influence appropriate arenas of school management. This concept of the career professional teacher is much more than an advanced-degree program and a career-ladder culmination; it seeks to influence the whole culture of teaching. Similarly, Holmes Group programs leading to the beginning credential should be characterized by students early on forming the expectation that as teachers they will exercise leadership in their schools and in the profession.

Leadership stance of the principal

Two decades of research findings have helped us to understand better, although not completely, what constitutes a good school. These findings have at least two strands that argue against the "one school/one leader" approach. One strand notes that good schools are educational settings where leadership is shared among teachers and administrators. This shared leadership may be the consequence of a conscious decision, or it may just emerge as matches are found between particular school issues and faculty members' individual expertise and interest. In either case, the principal relinquishes some of his or her designated authority to teachers. The other strand of research acknowledges that a school needs many kinds of expertise in order for it to be effective—curriculum development, the school's outreach to parents and the community, evaluation of programs and personnel, test construction and use, creation of instructional materials, and others. To expect that the school principal can provide intellectual and practical leadership in all of these areas is unrealistic.

Complementary research speaks to satisfying conditions of work for teachers. These must include more than amiable interactions, clean and quiet hallways, adequate salaries, and other largely extrinsic features of a work life. There must also be professional interactions with colleagues, input into the decisions that affect classroom instruction and children's life in school, opportunity to use experience, insight, and inventiveness to solve school problems, perception of colleagues' support in intellectual as well as personal ways, and *being able to choose to continue working with students while also assuming leadership responsibilities.*

All of this research argues for considering teacher leadership as an expected and accustomed feature of schools and for instilling in the curricula for prospective teachers and for school administrators the concept that eventual leadership—whether formal position or informal role—is an expected and accustomed aspect of the experienced teacher's job.

Leadership for preservice and inservice

Preservice teachers and administrator interns should be placed in schools where teacher leadership is present and should focus some of their practicum observations on what the teacher leaders think about and do. Teacher leaders from schools should be appointed part time or temporarily to faculties of education to provide instruction to preservice students. Teachers-to-be should read, critique, and review theoretical, research-related, and practical conceptions of teacher leadership. Their attention should be directed to a number of teacher union efforts that are focused directly on teacher leadership in curricular, instructional, school restructuring, and other substantive issues.

More importantly, perhaps, preservice teacher education programs should create opportunities for the students themselves to exert leadership. There can be many options; for instance, leading reflective discussions with others in their student cohort, taking responsibility for aspects of the cohort's relationships with schools, developing tutoring or mentoring programs for children and youth in community agencies, writing and distributing handbooks for subsequent cohorts of prospective teachers. What is important is that those who elect to become teachers begin to move beyond the rhetoric of teacher leadership and *act* as leaders. Naturally, such actions should be accompanied by opportunities to reflect upon, learn from, and alter them.

Inservice should provide experienced teachers, either in school-based professional development programs or in university advanced degree programs, with opportunities to develop specializations in which they can assume far greater responsibility than before for the aims, qualities, and outcomes of their schools. Large portions of the responsibility for inservice education should be placed in the hands of expert teachers. This will result in two important benefits for schools, the first obvious and the second less so. First, both research and informal conversations with teachers testify that teachers far prefer improvement activities that they and their peers help design. This value may be rooted in a flawed conception of teaching—one that is so craft-oriented that any suggestions for change coming from a non-craft source are suspect. Still, there are aspects of practice in which deep understandings can be found only in the minds and dispositions of teachers.

The second benefit of teachers teaching teachers, which is less often acknowledged—particularly by policy makers—is that such activity increases the intellectual and practical resources available to a school or school district. That is, as teachers assume greater responsibility for working with their colleagues on matters of mutually perceived importance, there develops a cadre of people who can be more effective than administrative and supervisory personnel in working with individual teachers and whole faculties.

Two cautions accompany the idea of teacher leadership in preservice and inservice. First, it is not enough to assume that teachers can provide high quality advice and counsel to their peers simply *because* they are teachers. Teacher leadership, like many other human behaviors, needs to be learned (and taught) in intellectually sound and practically defensible ways. Leadership by teachers thus needs to be part of the content and process of the course and clinical work in the teacher preparation program, not simply a source of instruction and field supervision.

The second caution about teacher leadership applies particularly to administrator education: The proposal for advanced leadership roles for teachers is not a proposal to replace school principals. These teacher leaders should continue to work with children and youth. That work provides ongoing matter for inquiry and experimentation and keeps the teacher leader connected to teaching thought and practice.

The site administrator's role may shift to encompass advocacy for, enablement of, and collaboration with teacher leaders. Teachers need this very important support from principals so that they can work together to build a community of learning that is not suffocated by the bureaucracy of school systems.

The authority of this kind of administrative leadership comes from an involvement in the learning community that is active rather than reactive. The professional preparation of educational administrators thus should be entwined with teacher preparation, drawing from departments of curriculum and instruction, and focusing on issues of collegiality, collaboration, and skills in promoting problem solving, inquiry, and experimentation. School administrators who understand and are committed to this style of work will interact with teacher colleagues around the construction of a learning community, not as adversaries concerned about distribution of power.

Diversity

Differences among students are a commonplace of schooling and should be so treated in relation to other commonplaces of schooling. We believe that defining the public school as naturally, inevitably diverse in population will lead us to more thoughtful, intellectually and socially sound, and realistic teacher education programs. Students bring to public schools their allegiances to a number of cultural, racial, and ethnic heritages. They speak in many languages. They demonstrate a broad range of developmental levels. These and other forms of diversity influence their expectations for schools and learning, their willingness and readiness to become part of learning communities, their interactions with one another and with school practitioners; and all of these factors profoundly influence their learning.

Teachers need to know about the range of differences among students, be able to make meaningful learning situations for all students, and encourage connections among students. Confident in these abilities, teachers will value the richness that diversity can bring to the learning community—making it more interesting for both teachers and students, more cosmopolitan and thus representative of the world we all live in, more considered and considerate.

The current thinking about diversity as a given in our nation's schools is seriously inadequate if it focuses only on coping with this demographic and cultural phenomenon rather than capitalizing on it. There is little to be gained by tinkering at the margins of the issue in the form of preservice courses or professional development workshops that aim merely to modify existing practices for the student who is different from the so-called typical students.

A teacher education program should redirect attention to ways of using and celebrating student diversity as a central feature of a classroom. Research, proposition, and theory about the rich mixture of students in schools should be blended into all preservice experience on campus and in schools. This conception of school students as members of cohorts rather than as individual "problems" to be diagnosed and prescribed for, fits the picture of a school that is a learning community. Prospective teachers should be helped to understand that what is good for some students is more than likely to be good for others as well, independent of many of the differences within and across diverse student groups.

This is not to deny that learning disabled elementary students, for instance, need the skills and sensitivities of specialist teachers. Likewise, the student whose primary language is not English may need a specialist teacher; but regular classroom teachers should know theoretically how any language works to symbolize cognition and meaning, and practically how to help non-English speakers comprehend school experience. Preservice courses should provide significantly greater comprehensiveness about how students are genuinely, not stereotypically, different, and how these differences can be recognized and provided for. Along with comprehensiveness there must be integration in the professional education curriculum so that differences among students are seen in relation to one another, in positive rather than negative ways, and as possibilities for facilitating rather than frustrating teachers' work.

What might this comprehensive/integrated view of diverse learners look like in a preservice program? Instead of two courses, one focused on the "typical" developmental stages of children and youth offered by educational psychology, and another on "special" students offered by special education, there might be a year-long course that examines characteristics of diverse learners. Preservice students

might be required to observe a lesson or unit taught to diverse learners, to sort out the various patterns of diversity in the group (developmental, linguistic, cultural, etc.), to see the diversity within each learner, and to practice teaching and learning activities that are effective with particular groups and individuals. This extended course might be taught by a team of professors, each bringing a particular specialization but all sharing the value of diversity as a resource for, rather than as a constraint on, teaching.

In this way, students of teaching could come to regard the diverse nature of student groups as a natural phenomenon, and begin to create a foundation for their work that includes student variation as a matter of fact and expectation. Course work in educational psychology would continue to be the foundation in human learning and development, but ed psych now would systematically include and integrate practice and field work in diverse settings. Subsequent preservice courses and field work, whether in curriculum construction or social foundations or student teaching, would recapitulate this pattern.

As a curriculum topic for experienced teachers, student diversity has received too little attention. Although some states and some districts may mandate the completion of a course or a series of workshops that deal with such issues as bilingualism, multiculturalism, or mainstreaming, these offerings rarely are adequate to alter mindsets and teaching behavior. As with other subjects of importance for teachers, the issue of student diversity must be attended to in ways that are *intellectually sound*, *programmatically coherent*, considerate of the characteristics and requirements in the *participants' contexts*, and *intentional*.

If these criteria were taken seriously in university inservice programs on multiculturalism we might see teachers working together, perhaps with an internal or external expert, to define the range of learners and styles of learning in their schools. We would see teachers trying out different methods and content, tailored to their own schools' diverse students, and sharing the results of their inquiry with their colleagues. We would see teachers talking with parents more regularly and searchingly about learning and culture and language, and using what they find out to write lessons for students in school and home settings. We might see a course of multicultural activities spanning several years, treating curriculum, instructional materials, student grouping, testing and assessment, home/school relationships, and community agencies.

Without more teachers from America's rainbow of nations and peoples, all our efforts to make schools true learning communities may flounder. There can be no higher priority for universities, colleges of education, and school systems than the recruitment and education of powerful teachers and professors from the nation's minorities.

Extended Communities

The learning community of classroom and school is part of the wider community. It must reach out to parents and community members. A crisis is gripping the families of America's poor; schools need to be major forces within the coalitions that strive to roll back the assaults of poverty on the young and their families. Schools, teacher education programs, and education professionals have become seriously distanced from parents, community members, local businesses, civic organizations, and churches. Teachers need to develop meaningful and sustained connections with these people and organizations to increase the intellectual resources that the school can call upon as it works with students, to create support for schooling among the population at large, to make the school a resource for its whole community, and to energize the school as a force for societal and cultural change. The school can and should be the core institution in a community, and teachers should be leaders in working to make this a commonplace of schooling.

The historical place of a school in its community has eroded to the point that few American citizens believe that they can influence what happens in schools, nor do they know much about what happens in schools. Opinion polls reporting that many Americans see schools as problem places also reveal that they are unaware of the complexity of school problems or how they are being dealt with. There is a commonly expressed view that drug and alcohol abuse, student violence, and the like are *school* problems. They are *societal* problems, and their manifestation in schools unfortunately is quite logical.

Many education policy makers insist that schools would succeed if teachers only would work harder and return to traditional tasks of schools. Most teachers are working as hard as they can; and they know that most traditional conceptions of teaching do not fit today's youth and society's expectations of schooling. Many intended reforms seem counterproductive to teachers, even deadening to their efforts. For instance, state-level accountability measures tend to bureaucratize teaching. This is felt keenly at the elementary school level by teachers who have developed varied and successful approaches to teach reading but now feel compelled to teach by worksheets that conform to the normed tests.

Some of the arguments for school-site control and renewing the school as a community have noted the way in which the publics for education have fragmented. Now many schoolpeople feel that they must work for a political constituency that does not consist of the parents and neighbors of children at their school. Instead they must attempt to assuage the state legislature and the state school board—people who have no understanding of, nor direct personal stake in, their school.

Our nation's schools have become unfamiliar places to parents and to citizens who do not have school-age children. Few schools enlist parents in agreements by which parents either reinforce their own children's learning or join in the school's governance, goal setting, and rule making. Even fewer schools reach out to the community members who do not have children enrolled. Quite naturally, this latter group, even more than parents, sees the schools of today through the lenses of memories of their own schooling and frequently superficial media reports.

It is common to hear teachers and school administrators complain about parent apathy, nonparticipation, and other forms of disconnectedness. It is less common to hear these same persons discuss ways to involve parents in the work of schooling. There is a sense that parent disinterest and noninvolvement are somehow natural phenomena that must be expected and endured. In some cases, when parents do try to become involved, schoolpeople react with distrust, antagonism, or fear.

Yet teachers are effective in their work in some direct relation to the degree that parents and other adults in the school community are involved in the life of the school. Further, schools flourish only with strong intellectual and fiscal support from the communities they serve. This support must be foreshadowed by the development of a citizenry that is much more strongly vested in making schools work than is usually the case today.

Teachers need to contribute to that development in at least three ways:

1. **They must understand how to work with parents** of individual students so that school expectations are understood and acted upon in students' homes. In order to do this, they must understand students' cultural, linguistic, and family circumstances and use this understanding as one of the primary sources of knowledge for curricular and instructional decisions.

2. **Teachers need to be able to work together to make the school a cultural and intellectual resource for the community it serves.**

3. **Teachers need to see their own schools and immediate communities as parts of a much larger network of schools and communities.** Although much or most of the business of teaching and learning should be done at the school level, there are intellectual, economic, and political possibilities associated with larger numbers of individuals and institutions coming together in common cause.

Prospective teachers cannot be "trained" for any a simple, monolithic notion of schools and communities. Preservice education needs to prepare teachers who can live with imbalance and uncertainty, who can work on the agenda of the local school community within the wider publics that

form the school's context, and who can search for alternatives. Novices need to be prepared to adjust to their new positions in school systems without falling into the unquestioning, passive role that has been customary for beginners. At the same time, their preservice preparation must lead them to correct their vague or downright wrong understandings about large cities, culturally different peoples, poor people, and what a school must be about in such a context. This is difficult for a teacher preparation program to accomplish because the culture of the university and the cultures of the public schools are very different. Students of teaching need to observe their teacher educators working sensitively, effectively, over time in urban schools; they need wise urban teachers as lecturers or co-instructors of their education courses.

The growing number of collaborative projects for urban schooling indicates that it is not difficult to involve universities and businesses with schools and teachers. However, universities are not capitalizing as effectively as we could on our recent educational research findings and on the growing respectability of connecting research, development, and theory building to practical situations in schools. Education schools need to secure more resources to support theoretically-driven research in which university faculty learn about inner-city schools by working in them. There is an acute need for teacher educators to become more involved in such research, in order to prepare students for work in inner-city schools and stimulate and inform their reflections about it.

It is particularly critical to maintain relationships between first-year teachers and universities. There are few systematic structures for maintaining those connections beyond occasional personal loyalties. The notion of an induction program that requires first-year teachers to have access to nearby teacher education programs extends the concept of teacher education beyond credentialing and into the schools themselves. For beginning teachers it raises issues of self-realization, locating resources, and working cooperatively and collaboratively. For teacher educators an induction program becomes a way of systematically examining the consequences of the teacher education program.

What might be the role of teacher education in returning the school to the community it serves and widening the vision and practice of teachers toward the concept of the school's extended community? In preservice programs, students of teaching can enhance their text-and-lecture-driven cultural learnings by conducting case studies of cultures *in situ*. They can be expected in their social foundations courses to attend, analyze, and discuss the events of meetings of community organizations, school board sessions, and the like. As part of their study of child and youth development, they can observe youngsters in non-school situations like boys' and girls' clubs, day care centers, and on neighborhood playgrounds. Instead of only hearing about the changing American family in introductory and advanced sociology courses, they can do door-to-door survey research, analyzing what they discover from the vantage-point of the findings' implications for schools.

For first-year teachers, their orientation and professional development sessions should focus in large measure on the families from which their students come, with attention paid to ethnicity, culture, socioeconomic status, language, and family structure. Still, this level of understanding will be insufficient to cause new teachers to use that information in instructional decision making. They also should be helped to develop lessons that take account of children's backgrounds and use them as resources for individual and group learning. New teachers should be supported to invent and try out approaches that involve parents in students' learning, at home and in the classroom. They should be put in sustained contact with experienced teachers who work with parents sensitively and productively.

At first, novice teachers need to learn how to communicate with parents of students to gain their involvement in the school. Then teachers can be encouraged to direct their attention to how other adults in the community can benefit from the school. For example, in places where there is adult illiteracy, teachers might work together to develop schemes that integrate adult and child learning. They might help develop schedules that keep the school open and welcoming all day and into the evening. They might help students do service projects—in nursing homes, early childhood centers, day care centers, and social service organizations—that make use of their school learning.

Such interactions with the community can serve as an important focus for inservice education. Even though some might see such projects as adding non-school responsibilities to teachers' already crowded professional lives, what teachers do to promote their schools' interactions with the community and the larger society will facilitate children's learning. But they will require deliberate and systematic attention over a long time.

All teachers will not and should not be involved with all such activities. But some teachers should become experts in teacher/parent and school/community relationships. As noted in the earlier discussion of teacher leadership, some teachers' expertise and advanced status can be used to develop ways of engaging with the community that extend the professionalism of their colleagues.

Preservice and inservice programs of this sort will require that the whole faculty of the school of education view research on practice more positively and promote active involvement at schools as valid, valued criteria for promotion and tenure. The education of new teachers too long has been the stepchild of the university; too frequently it has low status even in the school of education. We need to question sharply the values of higher education regarding the preparation of new teachers. The concept of the school as a learning community can be promulgated effectively only if it accords with a faculty's principles for its own department, education school, and the university at large.

Members of the Curriculum Committee

Jane Applegate
Associate Dean, College of Education, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio

Mary-Dean Barringer
Special Assistant to the President, National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, Detroit, Michigan
formerly Special Education Teacher, Wayne County Intermediate School District, Wayne, Michigan

James Cooper (Chair, 1989-1990)
Dean, Curry School of Education, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia

Marjorie Gardner
Senior Research Associate, Lawrence Hall of Science, University of California-Berkeley,
and Research Professor, Utah State University, Logan, Utah
formerly Director, Lawrence Hall of Science

Thomas Good
Professor, College of Education, and Research Associate, Center for Research in Social Behavior,
University of Missouri-Columbia, Columbia, Missouri

Gary A. Griffin (Chair 1988-1989)
Professor, College of Education, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona
formerly Dean, College of Education, University of Illinois-Chicago, Chicago, Illinois

Mary McDonnell Harris
Dean, Center for Teaching and Learning, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, North Dakota

Carol McGinnis Kay
Dean, College of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina

Nola D. Lodge
Project Director, Native American Counselor Preparation Program,
Graduate School of Education, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah

Lucy Matos
Director, Central Park East One Elementary School, New York, New York

Claire L. Pelton
Supervisor for Curriculum, San Jose Unified School District, San Jose, California
and Vice Chair, National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, Detroit, Michigan

Marilyn Rauth
Executive Director, Educational Issues Department, American Federation of Teachers, Washington, D.C.

Sharon Robinson
Director of Instructional and Professional Development, National Education Association, Washington, D.C.

Thomas Romberg
Professor, School of Education, and Director, National Center for Research in Mathematical Sciences Education, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, Wisconsin

Phillip Schlechty
President, Center for Leadership in School Reform, Louisville, Kentucky
formerly Director, Gheens Professional Development Center, Jefferson County Public Schools, Louisville, Kentucky

Peggy Shackelton
English Teacher, Santa Monica High School, Santa Monica-Malibu School District, Santa Monica, California

Walter Sherrill
Chemistry Teacher, Phillips Academy, Andover, Massachusetts
formerly teacher, Kenwood Academy, Chicago Public Schools, Chicago, Illinois

John Taylor
Dean, College of Education, California State University-Chico, Chico, California
formerly Director, Division of Learning and Instruction, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, United States Department of Education, Washington, D.C.

Karen Kepler Zumwalt
Professor, Department of Curriculum and Teaching, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York

Staff:

Marianne Amarel (1988)
Holmes Group consultant and Research Associate, National Center for Research on Teacher Education, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan;
and Research Associate, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey

Kathleen Devaney
Holmes Group Communications Specialist, Berkeley, California

Joseph Featherstone (1989-1990)
Holmes Group consultant and Professor of Education, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan

Judith Ponticell
Visiting lecturer, Department of Curriculum, Instruction and Evaluation, University of Illinois-Chicago, Chicago, Illinois;
and Director, Chicago Area School Effectiveness Council

Commentary by Lisa Delpit

Senior Research Associate
Institute for Urban Research
Morgan State University
Baltimore, Maryland

There is much that is praiseworthy in the report. I was particularly happy to see such a strong emphasis on creating a collective sense of community in which teachers and teacher educators become thinking partners who consider the task of teaching and learning an ongoing challenge. Although in some sections there is a risk that the information presented is so general that teacher education institutions will justify present practices as meeting the stated ideal, there are other sections in which specific recommendations are so clearly delineated that it is evident how fundamental a change is being advocated; for example, the list of activities on page 8 that suggests ways for students to learn through involvement, the specific strategies to encourage teacher leadership on page 22, and the recommended changes in social foundations courses on page 28. It would have been useful, I believe, to highlight specific recommendations such as these in all sections of the document.

What I believe to be missing in the report falls in two general areas. First, nowhere in the document is there discussed the need to provide for students of education a vision of their futures as connected to the futures of the students they teach; and second, I believe the sections are uneven in their attempt to address teaching in our multicultural society.

"When I am old. . ."

To elaborate on the first issue: In conducting a research project, I was touched by the comments of two teachers I interviewed about their relationships to the children they teach. One, an older African American preschool teacher pointed to a child in a corner playing with a toy truck. "You see that little black boy over there?" she said. "He's either going to grow up to steal my purse or be my doctor. I'm here to make sure he's going to be my doctor." The other teacher was a Native Alaskan woman who taught in her home village in rural Alaska. She said to me that the children she taught were her future. At first I took it as the rather trite stereotypic language of television commercials until she explained herself further. "When I am old, how I am treated, the quality of my life, will be completely dependent on the quality of the young people now in my classroom. If I want them to treat me well, I must make sure that they are treated well."

These teachers express one of the aspects I believe to be missing in the Curriculum Committee's report. Our teachers must not only see themselves as professionals who set up temporary learning communities in their classrooms or schools, but as human beings whose well-being is intimately

linked to the futures of the human beings in their care. When they can see themselves in that role, then they are likely to be perceived by their students as individuals who truly care. And there is now developing a body of data that strongly suggests that for those students who are least likely to do well in school, it is the interpersonal relationship between student and teacher that most influences their ultimate success.

"Nine great masters and one African basket"

A second shortcoming of the report is the unevenness of a concern about multiculturalism and diversity. Most lacking in this regard is the Liberal Learning section. If our teachers are to teach in a multicultural society, it is imperative that in their liberal studies they be able to learn about and appreciate the art, history, science, philosophies, and social organization of a range of cultures. Teachers cannot teach students whom they don't know. This entails a major overhaul of most university curricula.

Here is an example of the work we have before us: I received a frantic call recently from a woman whose task it was to put together a standards committee for the arts for the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. She was concerned about what she was finding as she contacted university-based artists, art historians and critics. She first discovered a great deal of resentment towards these standards-setters by women artists and artists of color, and she also collected a set of comments that disturbed and alarmed her. One white male "leader in the field," when asked about the necessity for addressing multiculturalism in the arts, said, "Oh, I view that kind of thinking as a sort of affirmative action in the arts—you know, nine great masters and one African basket!"

I would add to each subject area presented on pages 3 and 4, aspects of approaching the discipline with a disposition towards diversity in content and in conceptual framework. There are different bodies of content—say, African philosophers, or Chinese explorers—that are seldom included in liberal arts curricula. There are also different ways of thinking about and explaining phenomena and experience. For example, mathematics instruction may be made more accessible to many students of color (and others), if they are shown both examples of math and science thinking from their own historical legacies, ***and*** examples of how math and science are a part of their everyday world. Teachers need to know about their students' cultural pasts and those "ways of knowing," as well as about students' ways of knowing in their daily lives, in order to help them connect intellectually to subject matter.

In history, literature, social structures and behaviors, and ethics, it is imperative that teachers learn that there are varying perspectives for those of different social and cultural groups, and that they learn those

perspectives from the works of members of those groups. Thus, students may learn not merely to "appreciate diverse cultures," but to use the words and thoughts of diverse cultures to explore and critique their own thinking.

Within the Diversity section there is a statement on page that reads, "Prospective teachers should be helped to understand that what is good for some students is more than likely to be good for others as well, independent of many of the differences within and across diverse student groups." Although I believe the committee to be making a plea that we not limit poor children, or children with special needs, to trivialized content, some educators may use such a statement to justify providing exactly the same instruction for all children. I believe this kind of thinking to be misguided. Certainly we want the same kinds of outcomes and quality of school experiences for all students, but students who come from different circumstances may need different roads to arrive there. Just as an earlier section of the text cautioned us to be aware that teachers have different needs, so students have different needs as well.

What the extended community can contribute

Finally, although it is important that we begin to think of our schools as serving extended communities, we cannot disassociate Liberal Learning, Learning and Knowing, Teaching, and Curriculum, and the rest from the extended community. Where in the report are recommendations to solicit the extended community's input on curriculum, on concepts of what makes a good teacher for a particular setting, on ways of learning and knowing? These issues are interconnected and cannot be approached as if they existed independently. With community concern about what our students are learning never greater (witness, for example, the recent demands of parents and community groups all over the nation for creating multicultural and "Afrocentric" curricula), teachers and teacher educators must learn to broaden the base for participation in educational policy.

Commentary by Antoine M. Garibaldi

Dean, College of Arts and Sciences and
Professor of Education,
Xavier University of Louisiana

All the principles and practices that the Curriculum Committee recommends are well-conceived and inextricably intertwined. But I must-at the outset give the committee special commendation for emphasizing the theme of "a community of learning" throughout the paper, since this element is critical to successfully implementing any of the recommended strategies. Cooperation, collaboration, collegiality, and interdependence must exist among teachers, teacher educators, school administrators, parents, and officials in state departments of education in order for us to radically alter our present curriculum in teacher education.

I want to comment first on the liberal arts training of preservice teachers, second on the importance of a holistic treatment of diversity in the curriculum, and third on prospective teachers' need to have more clinical experiences in which they apply content and theory. Then I will offer my thoughts about teachers' relationships with extended communities. Finally, I will note a couple of additional areas that should be considered.

Depth in academic content

The pre-college training that many of our prospective teachers have had in secondary schools has not been of the quality that we once expected of entering college students. Because their high school education in the humanities and the sciences has typically been broad-brush treatments of important curriculum, it becomes our responsibility to make sure that the arts and sciences courses they take in college contain much more substantive knowledge. Once they have acquired that necessary depth in academic content, they should be ready to learn and apply the general and specific foundations and behavioral aspects of teaching. But many of our students do not fully understand that it is impossible to construct lesson plans and use a variety of methodological techniques unless they are thoroughly competent in subject matter.

Teacher educators must help prospective teachers both to understand the value of their arts and sciences courses and to recognize the implicit and explicit messages of cultural diversity that emanate from discussions of history, literature and fine arts, social structures and behavior, and other academic disciplines. As they learn to appreciate these differences in other cultures and societies, they will be better able to adapt their own teaching to the distinctive learning styles of their students.

The professional preparation of preservice teachers, in my view, must include additional academic knowledge related to diversity and multicultural contexts that can be incorporated into *and throughout* their professional education and their clinical teaching experiences. The Curriculum Committee first endorses this approach but then appears to depart from it with its proposal that there be a year-long course that examines the characteristics of diverse learners. Prospective teachers can only appreciate the "rich mixture of students" in classrooms by learning about them in all education courses, not by studying them in a separate course. Moreover, this limited and disconnected approach tends to perpetuate unsubstantiated stereotypes about ethnic minority and economically disadvantaged children.

Creativity and reflection about instructional methods

I also agree with the committee that preservice teachers must be trained to employ a variety of instructional approaches and modalities to accommodate the distinctive learning styles of students. Traditional approaches are useful, but teachers must be able to adapt and select the pedagogy most appropriate for their pupils—instructional methods that will not only increase their students' intellectual abilities but also their self concepts. Thus the teacher must be able to modify the traditional teaching method into movement-oriented, participatory and exploratory activities for students—for instance, laboratory or small group/team exercises, discussion sessions, and instructional uses of music and the visual and dramatic arts.

Teachers must be highly creative and be able to communicate with children and youth in contemporary forms that students understand and enjoy. Developing and using these new approaches during teacher preparation not only advances the aim of the Curriculum Committee to promote "self-conscious reflection" by prospective teachers but it also bolsters the committee's belief "that learning is strengthened by thoughtful discussion, invention, experimentation, and sharing of ideas. . . ." These goals of having teachers and students challenge their curiosity, improve their analytical abilities, heighten their propensity to discover new ways of knowing, and express their own creativity are thoughtfully interspersed in the sections on Learning and Knowing, Teaching, Curriculum, and Schools. When teachers realize that such freedom of expression in teaching subject matter is not only possible but desirable, they will achieve the committee's goal to "construct curriculum that impels powerful learning."

I also wish to echo my strong agreement with the committee's emphasis on increasing preservice teachers' ability to apply and "translate school subjects into terms that have meaning in their students' present and future lives." Pedagogical knowledge is useless unless student teachers know when and how

to use it. And the best way for teacher education students to practice is in diverse, real situations. Teaching candidates should be exposed to a variety of students and schools as early as their first semester of preservice education. Moreover, they should be assigned to different schools and classrooms every semester of their academic programs, so that they can both observe and participate in the daily activities of teachers in varied school environments. Additionally, students in methods courses should be required to tutor and to perform microteaching in classrooms and schools, so that they can reality-test the suitability of particular instructional approaches for children of exceptional, average, and below-average abilities.

In some recent writings I have proposed that teacher education majors should be required to perform a minimum of 20 hours of combined one-on-one tutoring and group and/or classroom instruction within specific methods courses, so that they can practice teaching that content to students while simultaneously applying varied instructional techniques. Even more importantly, serious consideration should be given to extending student teaching experiences to an entire year rather than one semester, or at the very least to increasing the amount of required clock hours during the student teaching semester. A more extended student teaching experience will help them to become more efficient planners and organizers of instruction as well as better classroom managers. Giving prospective teachers the first-hand opportunity to compare the functioning of schools that have ample resources with schools that are inadequately provisioned—where they are likely to find themselves early in their careers—will help them learn quickly that they must be resourceful and innovative, since there are few ideal, homogeneous classrooms where one instructional approach will always work.

Communication with parents and communities

I was pleased to see the inclusion of the last section of the report, Extended Communities. It is very true that many teachers complain about parent apathy and their limited participation in school activities, but it is also true that we have done little to try to reverse that trend. Novice teachers must therefore be trained how to communicate better and work more closely with the parents of their students, and learn how to work effectively with civic, religious, business, and other community groups and obtain resources to motivate, encourage, and reward children's academic performance.

Parents can become more effective partners in the educational process when teachers know how to tell them about their children's academic strengths as well as their weaknesses. These types of balanced evaluations give teachers the opportunity to suggest to parents ways in which their children might develop better study skills, more self-confidence, and make more constructive uses of their time after school. Emphasizing the positive characteristics of children, even when their academic abilities are below average, is a very constructive way of demonstrating to parents their role in encouraging,

assisting, and monitoring more closely their children's school work. All of this and more is possible in communities across this country.

Attention to assessment, competing theories, and texts

Skill in educational assessment was not specifically discussed in the paper, but I believe it is critically important for preservice teachers. Their instructional skills are significantly enhanced when they know how to evaluate students' academic progress and to diagnose their pupils' strengths and weaknesses. Because of the tremendous cultural and academic diversity in most classrooms, teachers must be able to develop comprehensive criteria for assessment, and they must not allow their personal expectations of students to interfere with their academic evaluations of them. Furthermore, as they learn the traditional modes of assessment, they must also give serious attention to measures that take into account "value-added" achievement whereby gains in learning are evident on dimensions other than standardized tests. Recognizing and valuing talent on these dimensions becomes extremely important to students who are industrious and determined to succeed regardless of their racial backgrounds and economic circumstances.

Competing educational philosophies need to be discussed more often in teacher education courses, and faculty members should specifically indicate how sampling limitations reduce the generalizability of popular theories and instructional practices. Teacher educators must select and assign those professional education materials that devote ample attention to cultural differences and related issues of diversity. Moreover, the theoretical and applied research they cite should be recent and comprehensively covered throughout the textbook rather than treated solely in those areas where nonwhite students are traditionally—and often erroneously—discussed; that is, classroom management, psychological testing, and "high-risk students." Teacher educators must collectively and aggressively demand that publishers develop textbooks that address issues relevant to and inclusive of multicultural populations.

By taking more proactive stances to improve the quality of teacher preparation, as the Holmes Group Curriculum Committee has done, I am confident that we can enhance the quality of preservice teacher preparation, make schools more effective, and, most importantly, help teachers to regain their status as leaders. But this will have to be a shared undertaking for us to create the community of learning that our society so desperately needs.

Commentary by W. Robert Houston

Associate Dean for Academic Affairs
College of Education
University of Houston
Houston, Texas

I have read your most interesting report three times and reacted in positive and negative ways, sometimes wondering what is new, sometimes challenging the assumptions upon which your proposal rests, sometimes applauding your vision. Building a continuous teacher education program around a community of professional scholars who are dedicated to democratic ideals and social consciousness is an ideal in itself that may never be achieved but is a worthy goal.

I could not help but contrast your vision of schools and teacher education with those of the nearly 300 business-dominated commissions that have commanded the media's attention since we found out we were a nation at risk in 1983. Their emphasis has been on improving economic competitiveness, on basic skills to support business and industry rather than on higher order concepts or democratic values; and thus theirs is a focus much too narrow for schools and for teachers in the coming decades. Thus it is refreshing to read a report that takes a broader view of education.

I thought I was rereading John Dewey as you considered democratic values, active experience-based learning, life-long learning, and self-identity; and indeed you have not strayed far from concepts he espoused six decades ago. John Goodlad's recently released study also focuses on the school as a *democratic community*. Perhaps your two reports are harbingers of a future educational direction—a community of teachers in a school working together, a community educators and parents seeking common ends, a cadre of beginning teachers exploring teaching, a community of professional teachers, teacher educators, and their students.

The report expresses an idealistic conceptualization of schools and teacher education that could lead not only to improved teacher development, but also to improved learning at all levels of education. Yet in that idealism there is a certain naivete, a conceptual distance from the problems and operation of schools and teacher education, and a riptide-view that flows in a different direction from today's educational currents.

Even the most professional and proficient teachers would have difficulty demonstrating the knowledge and skills espoused in your report. You seem to expect preservice education to prepare teachers who can "live with imbalance and uncertainty" (page 27); and to expect teachers to draw residents of urban communities into schools, motivate and serve them, while engaging in a "systematic review and strengthening of the school's whole course of study" (page 13).

A total restructuring of education would be necessary to implement these expectations, and I recognize that this is what you call for. Schools would need to be reorganized, teacher education revamped, staff development and teacher empowerment reconceptualized, and the role of schools in communities revised. This momentous task would involve shifting public opinion and values, increasing community commitment to schools (including probable tax increases), realigning the power structure of school districts, reconceptualizing the nature of schooling and the organization of schools, and restructuring personnel practices in schools and in universities. The effort would be massive, perhaps impossible except in small demonstration centers. However, I assume that your purpose is to provide a blueprint for a new order, to use broad-brush strokes to sketch out an ideal program with promise to reshape America's educational system for the twenty-first century.

Despite its positive, proactive, stimulating, and conceptually strong position, the paper makes several assumptions that detract from its effectiveness.

1. The public will change its view that achievement, as measured by tests, is the basic criterion of a school's success. Reports for the past three decades have criticized schools for failing to educate students even in the most rudimentary basic skills. Yet the report does not account for this. The public does not understand the unintended consequences of its cries for accountability in its frustration caused by declining achievement scores. It does not understand the complexity of factors related to school achievement; for instance, increased student viewing of television, greater numbers of broken homes and working mothers, decreasing middle class and middle class values, increased substance abuse, and shifting values as reflected in media accounts of news.

2. Society will increase resources to restructure schools and teacher education. I agree that it is futile to implement this conception without altering the organization, working conditions, and time use in schools, and conceptualizing schools as fluid organizations (page 18); but support to do this requires considerable additional resources.

3. Teachers will value and will have time to undertake activities such as professional introspection, exploratory discussions with other teachers, and curriculum development. The more than 1,000 first-year teachers and their mentors whom we have surveyed during the past two years in the Houston School District's Teacher Conservation Project tell us that their most pressing problems are the *avalanche of paperwork* and *lack of personal time.* They are so busy completing reports, detailing lesson plans, recording student attendance, completing the paperwork required for special students, and maintaining school records that are increasingly required by legislation and

regulations that they do not have time to improve teaching, reflect on teaching, and work with others collaboratively.

4. **Teachers are homogeneous in their values, needs, goals, and professional competence.** While the report advocates teacher education that stresses teacher knowledge of and attention to *student diversity*, it does not consider the diversity *among teachers*. In describing ideal teacher education programs, the diversity in ethnicity, values, goals, cultures, and experiences among teachers is not considered. Prospective and inservice teachers are treated as if they have the same ideals, work ethics, professional perspectives, and aspirations for a life-long career in teaching. The report seems to assume that all teachers should and will want to devote the time and creative energy to their professional development.

5. **All teachers use similar conceptual tools in solving problems.** While expressing dedication to diversity, the report unrealistically describes fairly homogeneous professional actions; for instance, teachers who work well with others in community settings, are inquiry-oriented, and able to relate knowledge in one field to other fields.

6. **The curriculum of teacher education programs can be expanded to include new concepts** (for instance, scope and sequence of all curriculum (page 14); to live with imbalance and uncertainty (page 27); correct prospective teachers' vague or downright wrong understandings about large cities and culturally different peoples (page 28); and to do so through an experience-based curriculum that builds a community of educators.

In what ways could your report be sharpened and improved?

1. **Draw upon the ideas of differentiated staffing.** Schools should be staffed not only with professional teachers, but also with semi-professional and non-professional support persons. The latter can provide some of the human contact and technological expertise needed in schools, but under the direction of professional teachers. Data and materials need to be collected, reports written, meetings organized, and myriad details attended to, all requiring time. Research over the past two decades has demonstrated the value of such differentiated staffing on student development, and the efficacy of school roles that do not require the same level of competence as envisioned in your report. The concept of teacher leaders, or career professional teachers as espoused in other Holmes Group publications should sharpen your recommendations.

2. **Incorporate knowledge on developmental stages in teaching.** Research on teacher development has demonstrated the various stages of teaching; yet the report does not clearly distinguish how these could be accommodated. In some sections, it advocates advanced experiences, concepts, and teaching

performances for preservice teachers. What are the basic conceptions that preservice teachers should develop? What should be developed in the school as an apprentice? What should be developed later in leadership roles as masters?

Prospective teachers need to experience certain concepts and can do so by assisting professional teachers in non-professional roles. Later they can assume semiprofessional responsibilities as they learn about different models of teaching, cultural contexts, and human interaction. First-year teachers and experienced teachers too have different but important needs. Prospective teachers' need is to be supported, and they can be in professional communities composed of first-year teachers in cadres and as part of school teams.

3. **Assign first-year teachers a reduced load** in order to develop the knowledge, skills, and attitudes described in the report. Orientation and professional development sessions that focus on the individuality of students, on ethnicity, culture and family structure require time and extensive energy. Additional time is also required to develop lessons that take account of children's backgrounds.

4. **Employ the power in cadres of teachers and students** . Cadres, partnerships, and collaborative organizations have proven effective support systems for those engaged in the enterprise, according to studies in all fields and going back 50 years to army platoons. First-year teachers in our study who met regularly as a mutual support group during the past year have bonded together. This is a central idea in your conceptualization of an ideal teacher development program; it should be maintained, researched, and sharpened. Can the teachers in a school bond, and if so, what are the consequences of teacher turnover and staff changes? And what about groups who do not bond, do not work well together?

5. **Begin by developing the professional expertise of a cadre of competent master teachers** through advanced courses of study so they may become teacher leaders in schools. Holmes Group institutions need to get on with the development of such programs. This concept more adequately expresses the philosophical basis for the "master teacher" or the "Master of Education" degree originally designed to advance professional practice. Perhaps this is a place to begin to change the culture of schools—the development of truly master teacher leaders, and concurrently, the development of Professional Development Schools, so that demonstrations of effective practice can reinforce the preparation of master teachers.

6. **Build educational programs that draw on the diversity of teachers.** While diversity is one of the report's major themes, the very diversity that exists among teachers in preservice or inservice education programs is not considered. The report speaks only to teachers learning about and

capitalizing on the diversity of their students. While criticizing current thinking about the diversity of school-age students as only coping with demographic and cultural differences rather than *capitalizing* on them, the report ignores diversity among teachers.

7. Sharpen your conception of the central core responsibilities of schools and also of teacher education. When reading the report, focus is diffused by attempts to solve all social problems from the initial perspective of teacher education. Adult literacy and social reform programs are a far cry from educating teachers; related I grant you, but not central. Effectiveness may be related to a sharpened focus on schools' major responsibility in society. When achievement in basic subjects has been neglected as schools have ventured into other arenas, society has criticized schools, teachers, and schools of education that promulgated such broadening of scope. Schools cannot and should not do everything about everything. Priorities in education and priorities in teacher education need to be established.

The report is a manifesto for change in the operation of schools even more than for teacher education. It calls for major shifts in cultural biases, and it challenges current rhetoric about effectiveness of schools. While conceptual in nature, it will require political muscle to implement. It provides a challenge for those seeking more vibrant ways to prepare and continually educate teachers—a benchmark for action.

Commentary by Ann Lieberman

Professor, Department of Teaching and Curriculum
and Co-Director, National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching
Teachers College, Columbia University

My remarks are rooted in my experience as a teacher and teacher educator who has consistently been involved in problems of practice and attempts to build a community between schools and the university. I have tried to learn by organizing new structures and writing about them. That is good in that I have avoided obscurantism and have developed a sensitivity to the complexities of practice. But sometimes my closeness to practice limits my capacity for thinking about radically changing practice. (In the same way, teachers and principals resist that.) Nevertheless, all changes need to be grounded in the realities of people's work lives in real places—including, of course, the most radically changed schools. My response, then, comes from this orientation.

I feel very positively about this paper. I like the clear, concise statement of values put forth in the first three pages. They speak strongly to values that I hold, and are ones that I hear students and school people grappling with as well. My critical comments are conceived with the overall sense I get that, while the document means to be a constitution (that is, the values are broadly stated but it is clear that each institution will go about change in its own way), the tone shifts from a "should" stance ("every teacher should understand the role of the arts...") to an idealistic stance (the five interacting components of teaching). And one sentence ("This requires beefing up institutional relationships that, in most places, at this time, can only be described as fragile") suggests so much that it requires greater amplification if it is to be meaningful. My comments are attempts to deal with the nuances of the shifts in voice and substance that sometimes require examples, sometimes development of a broadly stated idea, and, at least in one case, suggested a new category.

On Learning and Knowing

This section gives the values, the current state, and some activities that might lead to changing the situation. This allows readers to hold a new vision, look at their existing practices, and think about some new ways of organizing their work. But this kind of explication is not consistent throughout the paper.

On Teaching

The "should" statements could be more precise and less threatening if there were always some examples given. On page 8, for instance, there are activities listed that help the reader understand how to enhance student learning. But in the next section, on teaching, we get only what we need to give up,

not what teacher educators might do. Here we need help on what might be reasonable activities that could develop "habits of mind"; for instance, working with cooperating teachers as a group and connecting them to the university; using case approaches to learning; or observations or critical incidents as subject matter to be discussed. After the teaching section (or maybe as part of it) there should be more discussion on intra- and inter-institutional arrangements. There are now more than 1,400 school-university partnerships. Without such a section, the document leans too heavily on an individual focus for change. Networks, coalitions, and partnerships are mechanisms for building community and engaging people in more public discussion about the complexities of practice. Creating collaborative structures comes about through a building process that takes time and practice. A one-liner does grave injustice to the organizational part of what is being suggested here. Examples are needed to enlarge people's vision of the possible that is rooted in real conditions as described.

On Curriculum

This section is strong on what should be and what is faulty about what we are doing now, but there is little help on *how* to enact anything in a different way. The last paragraph on page 14 means to suggest some new activities for the neophyte, but it is too abstract and leans so heavily on a process orientation that it is unrealistic for teachers—no matter how strong their preservice program. Student teachers still need some structures to aid them in *becoming* teachers who will inquire. As new teachers it is probably more important to see experienced teachers engaged in constructing curriculum and talking about it in relation to students. On page 15, at the end of the section, teachers are exhorted to "take risks"—but how? Again, suggestions for how this might come about need to be here. (For example, "In School X there are weekly curriculum meetings. Teachers discuss the development of the curriculum n their class and get help from their colleagues." At Central Park East in New York City this does happen. A teacher educator involved with such a school could use these examples as ways to exemplify teachers as curriculum constructors.)

On Leadership

This section lacks examples of structures that might enhance community. School-site committees and processes for shared decision-making are providing necessary forums for teachers. There might be a little discussion about the attempts at formal leadership roles for teachers (for instance, in Rochester, New York, and in Charlotte-Mecklenburg, North Carolina) *vs.* the encouragement of informal roles developed in the current move to restructure schools. Similarly, union involvement in the creation of new roles (as facilitators, specialists, etc.) should be noted, as well as NEA and AFT involvement in leadership training and inservice. (The New York City Teacher Center Consortium of the United Federation of Teachers gives more than 100 courses with college credit to teachers.) Some school-

university partnerships, such as the Puget Sound Educational Consortium around Seattle, have deliberately taken on the preparation of teachers for leadership. Teachers themselves have done research on the problems and possibilities of teacher leadership. These real examples suggest ways of mating the "how" with the "should." Such examples need to be at hand as the report is discussed. Otherwise it slips into an idealistic but seemingly unachievable set of propositions.

On Diversity

I would add that university professors need to work with districts, unions, and other organizations to explore the range of possibilities in multicultural education—as some already are. The debate and discussion about multiculturalism is exploding now. School-university partnerships, Professional Development Schools, and a variety of collaborations with schoolpeople can be of great importance. The debate is complex, compounded by political and social factors, as well as by differing perspectives and values. This section is too tame when compared to the raging debate. Discussions of the report should note that there are bold experiments taking place, disagreements in policy and practice, and much to be developed and learned collectively.

On Extended Communities

I would add that those in higher education who teach teachers need to be involved in restructuring their own courses and relationships to build community at the university level. The document kind of peters out at the end without any suggestions for what a "learning community" might look like in the university

General Comments

The general sense I have is that the report needs more examples of how to work with experienced teachers. It is heavy on preservice, but there is little direction for those teacher educators who teach teachers, or who do collaborative or solo research and development with school people in a variety of capacities—formative evaluation, working collaboratively to develop structures, curriculum, instructional strategies, new ways of thinking, etc. Some academics have found ways to do this. Inter-institutional arrangements (not only the Professional Development Schools) need to be suggested.

I would use this document with my colleagues to serve as a means to discuss building a community in our own institution. But I would also use it as a stimulus for discussion with the experienced teachers that I teach, adding examples from my experience and knowledge that show the actual possibilities for change.